Attorney Docket Number: FSP0050
Title: ERROR HANDLING SCHEME FOR TIME-CRITICAL PROCESSING ENVIRONMENTS
Application Number: 10/827,158



**REMARKS**

In an office action mailed on 06/15/2007, claims 1-8 are allowed. Claims 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by Wong, US 6871350, and claim 10 is objected to as dependent on a rejected base claim.

In the rejection of claim 9, the Office Action cites Wong, col. 5, lines 57-62 and Fig. 4, which teaches that no kernel resources can be held when GRE 64 calls the user-mode graphics driver 62 (to ensure that a driver error cannot cause the system to wait indefinitely). In this embodiment, the KM Proxy Layer 70 releases and reacquires resources as necessary. Here Wong merely teaches that the described architecture helps prevent system hangs if the driver crashes. There is no description here, explicit or implied, about:

1. reconfiguring command routing logic for the device driver logic as a result of detecting an error,
2. so that command processing logic of the device driver is not invoked,
3. and returning from commands in a manner indicative of successful completion of command processing.

Notice that Wong is actually teaching away from the present claims by teaching, contrary to the claims, that the errors are returned to the caller, instead of an indication of successful invocation of the command processing logic. *This feature of Wong is in direct contradiction of the teaching of claim 9.* The Office Action further cites Wong, col. 6, lines 27-47, which teaches that when a user-mode graphics driver 62 calls back via an EngXX function, the call is serviced by a user-mode EngXX stub in the UM Proxy Layer 74, which in turn calls kernel-mode via the corresponding call (depicted as NtGdiEngXX) in FIG. 2) provided by the KM Proxy Layer 70 (104). Here, Wong merely

describes the callback sequence for the user mode device driver, where the call is stubbed to kernel mode code.

Claim 11 further recites that as a result of correction of the error, the command routing logic is reconfigured again to invoke command processing logic of the driver logic in response to commands. The Office Action cites Wong, col. 6, lines 35-46, which teaches that the KM Proxy Layer 70 invokes the Proxy Layer Object Manager 76 to find and substitute the original kernel-mode GRE 64 object (108-112). In addition, for any user-mode memory buffers that are passed (114), the Proxy Layer Object Manager 76 either secures it or makes a kernel-mode copy (116). Finally, it performs parameter checking such as checking for illegal, out-of-range, or inconsistent values (120-122). After the Proxy Layer Object Manager 76 has finished these tasks, the KM Proxy Layer 70 calls the kernel-mode EngXX function in GRE 64 (128). If there are any errors, they are returned (110, 118, 124, 126). Here Wong merely describes moving data objects and buffers from user mode to kernel mode, and checking the parameters of the commands themselves for proper value. There is nothing about reconfiguring the command processing logic again as a result of correction of the error, to again invoke command processing logic of the driver logic in response to commands. Furthermore, notice that Wong is actually teaching away from the present claims by teaching, contrary to the claims, that the errors are returned to the caller, instead of an indication of successful invocation.

*Wong is quite simply not even directed to the same application as the present claims, in other words, Wong is simply not directed to handling errors by reconfiguring the command routing logic, while indicating the erroneous the commands completed successfully.*

The rejection should be withdrawn and all claims allowed. Applicant has amply demonstrated the novelty of the claims over all cited references, and now respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowability be issued covering the pending claims. If the

Attorney Docket Number: FSP0050
Title: ERROR HANDLING SCHEME FOR TIME-CRITICAL PROCESSING ENVIRONMENTS
Application Number: 10/827,158



Examiner believes that a telephone interview would in any way advance prosecution of the present application, please contact the undersigned.

Signature /Charles A. Mirho/ Date: 10/15/2007
Charles A. Mirho
Reg. 41,199
Attorney for Applicant

Address all correspondence to:
FSP LLC
Attn: Charles A Mirho
P.O. Box 890
Vancouver, WA 98666-0890
USA

Phone: 360-737-1748
Fax: 360-294-6426